

App. No. 10/055646
Office Action Dated February 19, 2004
Amendment Dated May 19, 2004

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and following remarks. Claim 1 is hereby amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-15 are pending.

Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamazaki et al. (US 2001/0006827). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection made by the Examiner for the reasons discussed below.

Claim 1 has been amended to add the limitation "the plane evaporation source has a plurality of evaporating material cells arranged in array" in order to more clearly identify a novel and non-obvious feature of the claimed invention. Support of the limitation can be found on page 5, lines 21-30 of the present application. No new matter has been added.

The specification of the present application disclosed Yamazaki (U.S. 2001/0006827) in the "Description of the Related Art" and explained what Yamazaki disclosed an evaporating method utilizing a "linear evaporation source". Specifically, Yamazaki discloses "a rectangular shaped evaporation source 104, in which a plurality of evaporation cells 103 are lined up on a straight line" and "a plurality of evaporation cells are formed in alignment", respectively in paragraph [0013] and [0017] of Yamazaki. Hence, the evaporation cells utilized by Yamazaki would be reasonably regarded by one skilled in the art as a "linear

App. No. 10/055646
Office Action Dated February 19, 2004
Amendment Dated May 19, 2004

“evaporation source” which has a plurality of evaporation cells arranged in a line. The term “linear” means that the arrangement of the plurality of evaporation cells is linear, rather than describing the shape of evaporation source. Likewise, the term “plane evaporation source” recited in the present invention means the plurality of evaporation cells thereof is arranged in a two-dimensional layout such as an array, referring to page 5, lines 24-30 of the present application. Accordingly, it is applicant's belief that a person of ordinary skill in the art would consider that the plane evaporation source defined by the present invention is distinct from the linear evaporation source disclosed by Yamazaki in view of the present specification.

Moreover, according to first embodiment of the present specification, a plurality of first thin film 36 arranged in array are deposited on predetermined regions of the metal plate, and the first thin film arranged in array are used as evaporating material cells. Accordingly, the limitation of “the plane evaporation source has a plurality of evaporating material cells arranged in array” is supported and has clear and definite meaning.

According to amended claim 1, a plane evaporation source having a plurality of evaporating material cells arranged in array is provided to place below a mask. The phrase “arranged in array” describes the plurality of evaporating material cells (the same as evaporation cells) are arranged in a two-dimensional layout to comprise a plane evaporation source. The term “array” is known in the prior art of display technology and most commonly

App. No. 10/055646
Office Action Dated February 19, 2004
Amendment Dated May 19, 2004

used to mean elements arranged in rows and columns, such as "pixels array" or "light emitting diodes array".

However, Yamazaki does not teach the evaporation source has a plurality of evaporating material cells arranged in array. To the contrary, the plurality of evaporating material cells are arranged in a line, as disclosed in paragraph [0013] and [0017] of Yamazaki.

As discussed above, Yamazaki fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in amended claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that amended claim 1 is not anticipated or rendered obvious by Yamazaki.

It is therefore applicant's belief that claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference for at the above-cited reasons. Insofar as claims 2-7 depend either directly or indirectly from amended claim 1, it is applicant's belief that those claims are also allowable. Applicant does not concede the correctness of the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 8-15.

App. No. 10/055646
Office Action Dated February 19, 2004
Amendment Dated May 19, 2004

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested. Any questions or concerns regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Michael D. Schumann, Reg. No. 30,422, at (612) 336.4638.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

By 
Michael D. Schumann
Reg. No. 30,422

Dated: May 19, 2004

MDS:mm